



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/659,949 06/07/96 LUDWIG L VCOR-00/11U

EXAMINER

B3M1/0520

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2317

4

DATE MAILED: 05/20/97

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application,
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- ☒ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
- ☒ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☒ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
- ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
- ☐

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

- ☒ Claims 1 - 28 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☒ Claims 1 have been cancelled.
- ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
- ☒ Claims 2 - 28 are rejected.
- ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
- ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
- ☒ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
- ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
- ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____ Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO 948).
- ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____ has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____ has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
- ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 O.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
- ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Part III DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 15-16, 18-19, 22-23, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Etherphone system as disclosed by Rangan "Software Architecture for Integration of Video Services in the Etherphone System".

As per claim 2, Rangan teaches a teleconferencing system essentially as claimed, comprising:

a teleconferencing manager [p.1396 fig.1 CM server],
at least one of said participant is a multimedia service [p.1396 col.1 lines 32-36 'video file server'] for providing video signal at another workstation [video access] and receiving video of another participant [store proceedings of conference].

As per claim 3, Rangan teaches a teleconferencing system essentially as claimed, comprising:

data conference capture tools and annotation tools [p.1396 col.1 lines 39-45 "Tiogavision"].

Rangan suggested providing a multimedia mail system [p.1402 col.1 last paragraph] with captured and annotated data. It is inherent that the multimedia mail can be collaborated in real time at different location, at different time at same location, or at different time and different location.

As per claim 5, it is rejected under similar rationale as for claim 3 above.

As per claim 6, it is apparent from p.1401 col.2 that AV capture include AV images of the preparing participant and AV image of other participants.

As per claim 7, Rangan teaches message marker [p.1402 col.1 2nd paragraph "annotation icon"].

As per claim 15, Rangan teaches depository being operable to receive and store multimedia mail messages under direction of the preparing participant [p.1401 "Video File Server"]

As per claim 16, Rangan teaches audio, video and data components [p.1402 col.1 first paragraph].

As per claim 18, it is rejected under similar rationale as for claim 28 below.

As per claim 19, Rangan teaches [p.1402 col.1 2nd paragraph] AV signal carried in either analog [video rope] or digital signal [digitized video frame].

As per claim 22, it is rejected under similar rationale as for claim 5 above.

As per claim 23, Rangan teaches message marker [p.1402 col.1 2nd paragraph "annotation icon"].

As per claim 28, Rangan teaches a method of conducting teleconference, comprising the steps of:

carrying AV signal among the workstations [apparent from fig.1];

managing a videoconference [p.1397]; and

storing, as a multimedia mail message [multimedia document], AV signals generated at the workstation of a preparing participant [p.1401 col.2 lines 2-10]; and

recording AV signal during videoconferencing [p.1401 col.2 line 5 "participant can store parts of their conference"];

storing, as a multimedia mail message [col.1 p.1402 last paragraph], data and AV signal during the conference [p.1401 col.2 lines 2-10 "multimedia document"] and forwarding multimedia mail to a receiving participant [apparent function of an e-mail facility].

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Etherphone system as disclosed by Rangan "Software Architecture for Integration of Video Services in the Etherphone System".

As per claims 4, Rangan does not disclose graphical animation device for generating animated graphic images to be included in a multimedia message. It is well known in the art to have animation graphic images in multimedia document. The type of media included in a multimedia mail would have been a matter of design choice dependent on the preference of the user composing the mail message.

Claims 10-14, 17 , 20-21, 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Etherphone system as disclosed by Rangan "Software Architecture for Integration of Video Services in the Etherphone System" and further in view of

Maeno "Distributed Desktop Conferencing System (MERMAID) Based on Group Communication Architecture".

As per claim 10, Rangan does not specifically disclose a data conference manager for managing data conference. Maeno disclose a teleconferencing integrating data and video conferencing. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a data conference manager with Rangan's system because it would enable participants to view and process multimedia documents simultaneously with voice + video conferencing [Maeno p.0522 col.1 first paragraph].

It is apparent in the system as modified that the conference recorder would record audio, video and data during the conference.

As per claim 11, Maeno teaches data capture tool, annotating shared data [p.0522 col.1 last paragraph].

As per claims 12-13, Rangan teaches conference recorder [p.1401 "Video File Server"]. It is apparent that the mail system would have storage for multimedia document such that it can be retrieve by a participant and information can be transfer between the mail system, conference recorder, and the multimedia document [Rangan p.1402].

As per claim 14, Rangan teaches AV file system for storing and retrieving audio video images [p.1401 "Video File Server"].

As per claim 17, it is rejected under similar rationale as for claims 5+10 above.

As per claim 20, it is rejected under similar rationale as for claims 5+10 above. Maeno teaches data capture tool, annotating captured data [p.0522 col.1 last paragraph].

As per claims 21, the references do not disclose generating animated graphic images to be included in a multimedia message. It is well known in the art to have animation graphic images in multimedia document. The type of media included in a multimedia mail would have been a matter of design choice dependent on the preference of the user composing the mail message.

As per claim 25, Rangan teaches conference recorder [p.1401 "Video File Server"]. It is apparent that the mail system would have storage for multimedia document such that it can be retrieve by a participant and information can be transfer between the mail system, conference recorder, and the multimedia document [Rangan p.1402].

As per claim 26, Maeno teaches data capture tool, annotating shared data [p.0522 col.1 last paragraph].

As per claim 27, Rangan and Maeno teach storing and retrieving multimedia document [Rangan p.1401 col.2 lines 8-10, Maeno p.0522 col.1 last paragraph].

Serial Number: 08/659,949
Art Unit: 2317

-8-

Claims 8-9 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Etherphone system as disclosed by Rangan "Software Architecture for Integration of Video Services in the Etherphone System" and further in view of Rosenbaum US patent 5,404,435.

As per claims 8-9, Rangan does not teach tag searcher for searching defined tag in multimedia mail message. Rosenbaum teaches a multimedia document system with searchable tags to enable retrieval of the whole or portion of the multimedia document. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Rosenbaum with Rangan and thereby arrives at the claimed invention.

As per claim 24, it is rejected under similar rationale as for claim 8 above.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Nakayama et al. US patent 5,363,507 teaches method and system for storing and retrieving collaboration information from teleconference sessions.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can

Serial Number: 08/659,949
Art Unit: 2317

-9-

normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Lee can be reached at (703) 305-9717. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 308-5359.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Dung Dinh", is written over a horizontal line.

Dung Dinh
Patent Examiner
May 14, 1997